

UNIVERSITY IMPACT DISTRICT REVIEW BOARD

111 North Front Street, Third Floor

Columbus, Ohio 43215

P (614) 645-8062

THE CITY OF
COLUMBUS

ANDREW J. GINTHER, MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF
DEVELOPMENT

MEETING SUMMARY

date

April 25, 2019

place

Michael B Coleman Government Center Hearing Room

111 North Front Street, Room 204

time

present

Frank Petruziello, Kerry Reeds, , Doreen Uhas Sauer, , Kay Bea Jones, Keoni Fleming

absent

Pasquale Grado, Steven Papineau

A.

4:06

Business of the Board

1.

motion by

Motion

Vote

Approval of Meeting Summary from February 28, 2019

Ms. Uhas Sauer / Mr. Reeds

To approve the meeting summary as submitted.

5-0

B.

Applications for Certificate of Approval

1.

address:

1756-1758 North high Street

Verizon

app no.:

UID_19-04-001

applicant:

Ryan Johnson

reviewed:

Rooftop Antennas

4:10 – 4:30

Recusal:

None

Staff Report:

Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions.

Ryan Johnson presented the proposal.

discussion:

- Mr. Fleming asked if they couldn't put all the antennas on the same sled.
- Mr. Johnson said they could, but the change would be very minor, about 8 inches and the view would look the same.
- Mr. Petruziello asked if anything that is currently on the roof was approved.
- Mr. Teba said that some of the batteries were approved.
- Mr. Petruziello asked if the applicant wanted forgiveness for what was previously installed and to also add antennas to that.
- Mr. Johnson replied that was correct.
- Ms. Jones said that the current layout was very ugly, and felt that something better had to come out of the process.
- Mr. Johnson replied that the current layout is better than what was previously approved by the Board.
- Ms. Jones asked him to return with a proposal that improves on the existing conditions. There are many artifacts visual from the street.
- Mr. Reeds asked if the antennas on the corner were being replaced.
- Mr. Johnson answered that they weren't.
- Mr. Reeds asked if the antennas couldn't be grouped together.
- Mr. Johnson said that would require bigger sleds.
- Mr. Petruziello asked if the battery packs needed to be visible from the street.
- Mr. Johnson said they weren't visible.
- Mr. Teba replied that they were.
- Mr. Petruziello asked if they couldn't organize the antennas, so that it doesn't look like a bunch of technology clustered together.
- Mr. Johnson asked if they wanted him to move the approved equipment and consolidate it.
- Mr. Petruziello replied that was one way to approach it. He asked if the batteries required a line of sight.

motion by motion vote	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Johnson said they weren't but they had been approved. • Mr. Fleming responded that they had been approved, but below the parapet wall. Proposal Tabled
2. address app no.: applicant: reviewed: 4:30 – 4:40 Recusal:	<div> <div>15 East 17th Avenue</div> <div>Sweetwaters Coffee and Tea</div> </div> UID_19-03-009 Moe Hassan / Harry Zellars Signs None
Staff report:	Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions. Harry Zellars presented the proposal.
discussion:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Petruziello asked how the electrical would be routed. • Mr. Zellars said it would be a penetration for each letter. • Mr. Petruziello asked if a raceway wouldn't be preferred because it would require less drilling into the façade. There would be 33 holes in the façade for this sign. • Mr. Zellars said that was a possibility. • Mr. Fleming added that this façade was a concrete façade and it wasn't the Sistine Chapel. • Mr. Jones said she liked the simplicity of the sign. • Mr. Reeds stated that the Blade sign should be moved over to correspond to the joint. • Mr. Zellars said he could do that.
motion by	Ms. Uhas Sauer / Ms. Jones
Motion	To approve the proposal with the following conditions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The blade sign be placed on the nearest seam.
Vote	5-0
3a. address app no.: applicant: reviewed: 4:40 – 4:45 Recusals:	<div> <div>1976 North High Street</div> <div>Ad Mural</div> </div> UID_19-04-004 David Hodge / Acme Googaw LLC. Graphics Motion to approve additional temporary Ad-mural. None
Staff Report:	Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions. Mike Shannon presented the proposal.
discussion:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Petruziello asked if the previously approved ad murals had the Wexner Center's address on them. • Mr. Teba verified that they did not. • Mike Shannon asked that the mural be approved.
Motion by:	Mr. Petruziello / Ms. Uhas Sauer
Motion	To approve the proposal as submitted
Vote:	5-0

3b. address	1976 North High Street	Ad Mural
app no.:	UID_19-04-004	
applicant:	David Hodge / Acme Googaw LLC.	
reviewed:	Graphics	
4:45 – 4:50	Modification of the Board approved ad mural guidelines for this location.	
Recusals:	None	
Staff Report:	Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions. Mike Shannon presented the proposal.	
discussion:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mr. Petruziello asked how long the applicant was requesting they be approved for.• Mr. Teba replied that it would be indefinitely as long as it was maintained in good repair, and then it could be staff approved. The Downtown commission, which this was modeled off of, always requires a term.• Ms. Jones asked why having the murals approved indefinitely would be a good thing.• Mr. Shannon asked that the proposal be tabled. It was his opinion that it addressed a specific concern and did not have a holistic approach. To modify the guidelines to address a specific concern without the input of all the stakeholders was inappropriate. He is not being critical of his partner, but Mr. Shannon just has a different philosophy. He requested the motion be tabled.	
Motion by:	Tabled	
Motion:		
Vote:		
3c. address	1976 North High Street	Ad Mural
app no.:	UID_19-04-004	
applicant:	David Hodge / Acme Googaw LLC.	
reviewed:	Graphics	
4:50 – 4:55	Extension of the current ad mural until the end of May.	
Recusals:	None	
Staff Report:	Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions. Mike Shannon presented the proposal.	
discussion:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ms. Uhas Sauer said she could not support an extension of the ad mural.• Mr. Shannon said he was trying to get an additional month to which the Board had previously said no. It is difficult to get people to change their minds. The Board could vote no, yes, or consider tabling the motion. The facts are Mr. Hodge made a mistake by contracting for 18 months until June 1st. The reality is that if they vote no, in theory, they would have to take down the sign. Code enforcement would have to get involved, and it would take longer than the 30 days he is asking for today. Or, some lawyer somewhere could find a reason to do an appeal to the Board of appeals, at which point code enforcement would have to be stayed, until after the June 1st date he was requested. He would like to get it approve for his partner however. He requested the motion be tabled.	
Motion by:	Tabled	
Motion:		
Vote:		

4. address	18 West 10th Avenue	Gateway Storefront
app no.:	UID_19-04-005	
applicant:	Christiana Moffa / David Keyser	
reviewed:	Signs	
4:55 – 5:00		
Recusals:	None	
Staff Report:	Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions. Mr. Keyser presented the proposal.	
discussion:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Fleming asked if there was some sort of graphics on the window. • Mr. Keyser said that it was just clear glass. 	
Motion by:	Ms. Uhas Sauer / Ms. Janes	
Motion:	To approve the proposal as submitted	
Vote:	5-0	
5. address	134 East 15th Avenue	Sorority
app no.:	UID_19-04-006	
applicant:	David Pontia	
reviewed:	Ext. Building Alterations	
5:00 – 5:		
Recusals:	None	
Staff Report:	Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions. David Pontia and Carol Meyer (Pella) presented the proposal.	
discussion:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms. Jones asked if they had considered doing the half round windows as one piece instead of two pie shaped pieces. • Mr. Pontia said that the Pella Fiberglass windows allow them to do it as one piece. • Mr. Petruziello asked if the columns had entices. • Mr. Pontia said they did not, but were replacing them like-for-like. • Mr. Petruziello asked why they hadn't considered entices. • Mr. Pontia said it could be added, but it would change the cost. • Ms. Jones said the columns were poorly proportioned. • Mr. Fleming asked if it was a problem that the Pella Impervia was only approved for casement style windows. • Mr. Teba replied that the HP staff who compiled the list felt it was too flat, but reminded the Board that they have the leeway to approve things not approved on the list. • Mr. Pontia said the main issue was that due to the clientele, the owner did not want wood windows. They would be exposed to some abuse due to being a sorority. It was not a cost issue. • Mr. Petruziello asked if the section of the window was different. • Ms. Meyer that the frame to glass ratio was thicker on an aluminum clad window, and they also look flatter. • Mr. Petruziello said he wasn't concerned about the material, but the shadowing and proportions. • Ms. Meyer replied that the windows being proposed were a great improvement over the flat wooden windows currently in the building. • Ms. Jones asked about the color of the double doors. • Mr. Pontia said it would be colored to match the existing color. • Mr. Petruziello asked if the doors would require a larger opening in the masonry. • Mr. Pontia replied that they would. • Ms. Jones said it wasn't aligning with the window above. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms. Jones asked if landscaping was included in the proposal. • Mr. Pontia said that there was a separate landscaping proposal that would be coming later.
Motion by:	Ms. Jones / Mr. Reeds
Motion	<p>To approve the proposal with the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the half windows being installed on the front façade not be broken up into quarter sections.
Vote:	5-0
6a. address	112 East 14 th Avenue
app no.:	UID_19-04-007
applicant:	Bradley Blumensheid
reviewed:	Variances / Ext. Building Alterations
5:35 – 5:38	Motion to approve variances
Recusals:	None
Staff Report:	<p>Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions. Mr. Blumensheid presented the proposal.</p>
discussion:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Petruziello said he liked the applicants parking plan better. • Ms. Jones agreed. • Mr. Fleming asked how many units there were. • Mr. Blumensheid said three. • Mr. Fleming asked how the parking was divided up relative to the units. • Mr. Blumensheid wasn't sure. • Mr. Petruziello said the reason he liked the applicants plan more was because if you can avoid stacked parking you should, because it is a pain. • Mr. Teba explained that while the stacked parking idea wasn't his, the idea was to be able to provide more landscaping and to encourage students to walk and use public transportation. The more you facilitate the automobile, the more likely students are to use it. • Mr. Teba reviewed the variances. • Mr. Petruziello asked if there was going to be any landscaping between the two properties. • Mr. Teba replied that there was not. • Mr. Fleming said there should be some sort of buffer. • Mr. Petruziello agreed. • Mr. Teba replied that was why they came up with the alternate parking plan. • Mr. Petruziello asked if the issue was related more to landscaping than the parking layout. • Mr. Teba confirmed that was correct. • Mr. Fleming said he recognized the need for parking, but he felt the applicant had to do better than just pave to the property line. He did not care that they did not provide the recommended parking spaces. • Mr. Petruziello said that staff's proposal did allow for better exiting of the parking lot. The applicant's proposal would require backing out in some instances. • Mr. Reeds asked how much distance there was from the rear of the parking spaces to the house in staff's proposal. • Mr. Blumensheid responded that there was about 20' to the curb, and 18" from the curb to the porch. • Mr. Reeds said that was tight. • Mr. Teba added that neither solution was great. • Mr. Reeds said you double stack them or there are less parking spaces. • Ms. Jones said she had no problem with the parking variance, in fact they could go lower and do that to solve the landscaping problems. • Mr. Fleming said he was not on board with eliminating the landscaping to zero.

<p>Motion by:</p> <p>Motion</p> <p>Vote:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Petruziello said they could do staff's proposal, or reduce one space and pull the parking spaces from the west closer to the east. <p>Ms. Jones / Mr. Reeds.</p> <p>To approve the variances with the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3312.13, Driveway: supported as presented. • 3312.21, Landscaping and screening: To reduce the required landscaped buffer width on the north side of the parking lot from 4 feet to 0 feet. <u>The variance to landscaping and screening to the west side is not supported.</u> • 3325.907, Parking: To reduce the required number of parking spaces from <u>10 to 7.</u> • 3325.705 (A): supported as presented. <p>5-0</p>
<p>6b. address</p> <p>app no.:</p> <p>applicant:</p> <p>reviewed:</p> <p>5:35 – 5:38</p> <p>Recusals:</p> <p>Staff Report:</p> <p>discussion:</p> <p>Motion by:</p> <p>Motion</p> <p>Vote:</p>	<p>112 East 14th Avenue</p> <p>UID_19-04-007</p> <p>Bradley Blumensheid</p> <p>Variances / Ext. Building Alterations</p> <p>Motion to approve building design</p> <p>None</p> <p>Multifamily</p> <p>Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions. Mr. Blumensheid presented the proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms. Uhas Sauer said that the house was a wonderful rooming house for arts and music students. But it has suffered some neglect. The driveway is very difficult to maneuver in an out. • Mr. Fleming said the windows were still an issue. • Mr. Teba said that last time they had discussed allowing vinyl on the addition, but putting something from the list on the original portion of the building. • Mr. Petruziello agreed with that idea. • Mr. Fleming agreed and added that it was a very nice contributing structure that needed something better than vinyl. • Mr. Petruziello said he did not like white windows on this house. Sandstone or darker beige could work. • Ms. Uhas Sauer said that a historic color palette would be appropriate for this building. • Mr. Petruziello replied that they needed a color study to determine what was appropriate. Somewhere between brown and not white. • Ms. Jones said that the balance of verticals and horizontals should be taken into consideration for the colors. <p>Ms. Jones / Mr. Petruziello</p> <p>To approve the proposal with the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the windows for the original contributing portion of the structure come from the approved window list. • That the parking layout comes for staff review and keeps a four foot landscaped buffer on the western property line.

7. address app no.: applicant: reviewed: 5:35 – 5:38 Recusals:	38 East 6th Avenue UID_19-04-009 Connie Klema Parking lot design None	Parking lot
Staff Report:	Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions. Ms. Klema presented the proposal.	
discussion:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Petruziello stated that they needed to see images of the fence and landscaping. • Ms. Jones agreed, they needed some sort of graphics for them to approve it. • Ms. Klema asked if they would need landscaper's design of how the area would look as well as a picture of the fence. • Ms. Jones said that was correct. • Ms. Klema asked if she needed to come back to the board for that. • Ms. Jones said she would be content letting staff approve it. • Mr. Fleming agreed. • Mr. Petruziello said that if Luis didn't like it he would kick it back to the board. 	
Motion by:	Mr. Reeds / Ms. Jones	
Motion	To approve the proposal with the following conditions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To allow staff to approve the revised submission. • The applicant properly specify the fencing type, color, height, and material. • Landscape plan be submitted as well. 	
Vote:	5-0	
C.	Applications for Zoning, Code Enforcement and/ or Conceptual Review	
1. address app no.: applicant: reviewed: 5:38– 6:00 Recusals:	1728 North High Street UID_19-04-008 Tim Lai/Eliza Ho Ext. Building Alterations	Midway
Staff Report:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions. • Joel Burke, Jack Reynolds, and Nathan Shroyer presented the proposal. 	
discussion:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms. Jones had concerns about the green wall and how well it would flourish on the site. • Mr. Burke said they would be rooted in traditional planters. • Ms. Jones asked what the vertical planters would be made of. • Mr. Burke said they would be cor-ten. • Ms. Jones asked for the applicants to study how to build the green wall. There will be students walking nearby. • Mr. Reeds said a Boston ivy vine could work, but you would need some measure of planting materials. It would also only be green for half the year and some of it will die. • Ms. Jones recommended that there were different ways of doing the green wall: wire in tension in space, etc... but it isn't standard construction which raises concerns about maintenance. • Mr. Petruziello said he would rather see the drawing done without the green, and then explain how the green wall will grow. He was concerned that the final product would end up being completely different than what was being proposed due to budgetary constraints. • Mr. Burke said that was a valid point, but they just wanted to come to the Board early on and get some feedback. 	

- Ms. Jones added that Session Village had good examples of diagonal wires holding ivy.
- Mr. Petruziello wondered if the idea of a green wall was even appropriate at this location as it is a north facing wall with a lot of traffic.
- Mr. Fleming asked the applicant to describe the change in concept and use related to the rebranding of the building.
- Mr. Shroyer said that it would cover a use that the other two building cannot meet. Mostly event space.
- Mr. Petruziello asked if there would be an assembly use issue at this location.
- Ms. Uhas Sauer asked what variances would be needed to do this.
- Mr. Reynolds said that there would be a parking variance to go from 26 to 0.
- Ms. Uhas Sauer stated that there is a great amount of discussion at the community level and at the UAC related to nature of the businesses at these two locations. There have been many complaints related to noise, underage drinking.
- Mr. Petruziello asked how the vertical cor-ten would form a railing.
- Mr. Burke said they would probably have a horizontal bar and be four inches apart.
- Mr. Fleming stated that Doreen wouldn't be the only one with a problem regarding the proposed use.
- Mr. Petruziello asked if the applicant was familiar with the staining issues with cor-ten.
- Mr. Burke replied that it can be pretreated and stabilized.

Motion by:

Motion:

Vote:

N/A – Conceptual Review

D.	6:00	Staff Issued Certificates of Approval (March Items)		
			Items approved:	COA issued
1.	101 McMillen Avenue UID_19-04-002	Roof		4/2/2019
2.	109 McMillen Avenue UID_19-04-003	Roof		4/2/2019
3.	342 King Avenue UID_19-04-010	Roof		4/18/2019
4.	57-59 East Lane Avenue UID_19-04-011	Roof		4/24/2019
Motion:		To approve the Staff Issued COA's		
Vote:		5-0		

E.	6:03	Board Issued Applications Issued Certificates of Approval (February Items)		
			Items approved:	COA issued
1.	1980 North High Street UID_19-02-014	Signs (Charley's)		3/29/2019
2.	1400 North High Street UID_19-03-001	Signs (Spectrum)		3/29/2019
3.	1764 North High Street UID_19-023-003	Signs (Dave's Cosmic)		4/02/2019
4.	2247-2289 North High Street UID_19-03-010	Signs (View on Pavey)		4/5/2019
Motion:		To approve the Board Issued COA's		
Vote:		5-0		